

79231

79231

Notes for Remarks
by
Ivan L. Head
President, International Development Research Centre
to the
EIGHTH WORLD CONGRESS
of the
PHYSICIANS FOR THE PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR WAR
Montreal, Quebec
Sunday, June 5, 1988.



HEAD
11-76

I wish at the outset to congratulate the organizers of this Conference for their inclusion of a plenary session dedicated to North-South relations in this important Conference. The term "North-South" is imprecise, utilizing a vagary of definitions and encouraging a variety of responses. It focusses primarily on the post World War II. The countries of the North (broadly those of OECD and those centrally planned economies of Eastern Europe) tend to be more industrialized and, in the aggregate, possess much less population than those in the South. Their superior technologies and higher percentages of well-trained labour give them, for the most part - and certainly in the aggregate - an impressive advantage in GNP and in per capita income. Those located in the Atlantic Basin and Europe have, for historic reasons which may never have been valid, and which today are of diminishing significance, associated themselves in this period with others into two powerful military alliances. Whether for this reason or otherwise, these countries have been remarkably successful in avoiding direct conflict among themselves.

Those in the South, for a variety of reasons, have been engaged in an endless sequence of international and domestic conflict, sometimes with Northern involvement, sometimes without. The numbers of these conflicts, the dreadful toll in human life -

17 million deaths in 1945 according to Ruth Leger Sivard - and the wasteful utilization of resources will, I have no doubt, be referred to by our speakers this morning. Now, with the level of East-West tensions diminishing, the danger of surrogate wars in the South remains, and could increase.

The barrenness of this type of conduct is readily evident from its results. But the most tragic aspect is its diversion of attention from the critical issues facing these countries, and the lost opportunities in consequence. The mounting of seemingly automatic military responses to every apparent challenge to authority leads to a skewing of threat perception and an inability to comprehend the underlying causes of instability. It reduces the emphasis sorely required for effective and legitimate regimes, for techniques for the peaceful settlement of disputes, for the use of skilled manpower in developmental activities. It contributes to adversarial attitudes and unrealistic responses: fortress concepts in all manner of activities - immigration, trade, currency. The ingredients which have contributed to these attitudes may or may not reflect indigenous, valid concerns; all too frequently, however, they are encouraged and assisted by the nations of the North. Arms, after all, are a profitable element of commerce for them. And there is clearly a demand. The employment of these

weapons is not always against other humans but our heritage suffers nevertheless. The acquisition of automatic weaponry by animal poachers in Africa has had the effect of reducing by more than 50% the numbers of African elephants in the past ten years.

Perhaps even more tragic in the long run than the expenditures made by the countries of the South for all too often high tech and high cost weaponry which they do not need, cannot afford, cannot maintain, and often cannot even employ properly - even more tragic is the decision of so many of them to model their economies on what they regard as successful Northern models, where defence industries appear to enjoy pride of place and claim to be originators of all kinds of technological breakthroughs transferable to the Canadian sector. Why expend foreign exchange on weapons when one can make one's own, perhaps even export them and earn money? And so we see in developing countries the proliferation of weapons industries; countries choosing to pattern their industrial sectors on wholly inappropriate models. Why make farming implements when it is guns that sell?

The tragedy of all this is its contribution to unreality in both North and South. In the South, the assumption that the route to economic development and political stability is

best charted on the basis of indiscriminately chosen northern models. In the North, the assumption is that the developing countries are only of peripheral consequence.

In fact, the future of the North is heavily dependent upon the South. Net financial flows are now from South to North in a magnitude of tens of billions of United States dollars annually. This has led to a structural dependence of North upon South. The population burden in the South is leading to environmental degradation of planetary dimensions. The economic stagnancy of so many developing countries is contributing to the long term economic doldrums in the North. Above all, the increasing inability of southern governments adequately to govern their own societies is an indicator of increasing political instability and physical insecurity for the North.

We live in an age where, in the South, demographic trends are threatening: overall numbers are increasing; urban concentrations are growing; populations are becoming younger. More rapidly than we in the North accept, evermore influential segments of southern population are increasingly uneducated, unemployed, devoid of hope. They owe allegiance only to factionalism - their gang, their tribe, their fundamentalist group. In these circumstances, any expectations in either North

or South of social tranquility and political stability are highly exaggerated. In an age of ready access to sophisticated automatic weaponry, of increasingly dedicated terrorist and insurgent groups, the current talk of moving towards even more miniaturized nuclear ammunitions is suicidal in its overtones.

"North-South", in my judgement, is incorrect. It follows from the same inclination of dominance that has given us those other phrases: master-servant, husband-wife, heaven-earth, in which the superior component precedes the other. If that is the case, "South-North" should now be the appropriate order. Especially is this so in the wake of the Moscow Summit and the hopefully changed attitudes of the super-powers one towards the other. South-North rightfully represents the most critical element of international affairs. It is more far-reaching, more resonant of human implications, more promising of human benefit than is its counterpart, East-West. It is more involved by far with what is surely the most significant range of human activities and human expectations: survival of the species and the environment, human wholesomeness, the richness of human culture, the dignity of the individual.

The enriching contribution to all of our lives, both North and South, of healthy, educated, active human beings in the

South, confident of their futures, is surely a goal worthy of our efforts. In the larger context of the nuclear age, it is absolutely essential.

Against that background the three speakers this morning will address you.

(following speakers)

This has been a rich morning. One which has demonstrated the frailty of our species as Charles Clements revealed the narrowness of the margin between responsible acts and irreparable error.

Jacques Fontanel nous a expliqué les grands défis associés aux changements nécessaires si nous voulons repenser nos économies et nos politiques de façon à nous assurer un futur meilleur, un futur sans désastre nucléaire.

Gwendoline Konie brought to us the perceptive insights of an experienced observer and participant from the

South. She shared with us in eloquent fashion the agonies of decision-makers in the South as they seek an equitable involvement in the councils and markets of the world.

To each of them I invite you to express once more your appreciation.

The speakers have well demonstrated that in this age of planetary actors, for the first time in history, not only can error be irremedial (as we know) but momentum threatens to be irreversible.

Most important of all, they have demonstrated that intellectually disciplined, dedicated, knowledgeable persons can be influential, can make a difference.

Thank you and good morning.